REMARKS

I.   Status of the Application

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 17, 19, 24, 29-30, and 37-40, 42-46, 49-50, 63-74 are pending in the above-identified application. With this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 6, 8-10, 19, 24, 40, and 72-74. The amendments are supported by the application as filed and therefore do not add new matter. Accordingly, entry of the amendments and the new claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended the claims to recite particular embodiments that Applicants, in their business judgment, have determined to be commercially desirable at this time. The claim amendments have not been submitted for any reason relating to patentability, such as to overcome any one or more of the Examiner's rejections. Indeed, Applicants believe that the Examiner has not established a prima facie showing to support the Examiner's rejections and, as such, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the previously presented, and of the previously or currently cancelled claims in one or more continuing applications.

II.   Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-20, 22-26, 28-29, 31-32, 37-38, 40-42, 44-45, 47-49, 50-52, 54, 56, 58-59, and 61-74 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,014,643 (hereinafter "Minton") in view of European Patent Application No. 0 665 489 A2 (hereinafter "Robertson") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,006,991 (hereinafter "Keiser"). Although the Examiner set forth in the preamble of this rejection that the above claims were rejected in part using Keiser, the Examiner cited U.S. Patent No. 6,115,698 (hereinafter "Tuck") in rejecting the claims individually. Applicants presume for the purpose of this response that the Examiner cites to Tuck and not Keisser.

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 21, 39 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,809,741 (hereinafter "Bates"). The Examiner further rejected claims 9, 12, 27, 30, 43, 46, 57 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Robertson and in further view of U.S. patent No. 6,161,099 (hereinafter "Harrington"). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

A. Independent Claims 1, 19, and 68

It is respectfully submitted that none of the references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 19, and 68. Specifically, Minton, Robertson, Tuck, Bates, and Harrington fail to teach or suggest a method wherein a trading command is received via a first interface that includes a selectable trading variable, such as a bid variable or an offer variable, displayed therein that when selected results in the presentation of a second interface screen, as recited in respective claims 1, 19, and 68. Consequently, the references further fail to teach or suggest presenting a second interface that includes at least one button therein for confirming the trading command in response to a selection of the selectable trading variable, as recited in claims 1, 19, and 68, and automatically repositioning a pointer over the at least one button in response to a selection of the selectable trading variable as recited in claims 1 and 68.

The Examiner asserts that Minton discloses these features with reference to Minton's Figs. 6 and 7, and Col. 10, line 54 to Col. 12, line 20. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Minton discusses that a user can place orders to buy or sell a security by activating the buy and sell buttons shown in Fig. 4. Activation of

these buttons causes the buy screen of Fig. 6 and the sell screen of Fig. 7 to be displayed. (Col. 9, lines 18-30). The buy and sell screens are where information relating to an order is entered. (Col. 10, lines 54-55; Col. 11, lines 52-53). In both screens, a user must enter the pricing and quantity information for a security they wish to purchase or sell. (Col. 10, lines 57-58; Col. 11, lines 54-55). In Fig. 6, "[q]uantity field 620 allows one to specify the number of shares of a given security they wish to purchase." (Col. 11, lines 1-2). "Limit price field 622 allows one to specify a maximum price for the security to be brought." (Col. 11, lines 2-4). The corresponding fields in Fig. 7 allow one to specify the number of shares and the price for selling the security. ((Col. 11, lines 61-63).

Therefore, the price and size data shown in Minton's Figs. 6 and 7 are merely user inputs for specifying the terms of the order and are not selectable for submitting a trading command. Accordingly, Minton fails to disclose selectable trading variables, such as a bid variable or an offer variable, for submitting trading commands, that when selected cause the second interface screen to be presented, as recited in respective claims 1, 19, and 68.

Claim 19 further recites that the second interface comprises a price field and a size field, wherein the bid price is posted in the price field with the selection of the bid price in the first interface, the bid size is posted in the size field with the selection of the bid size in the first interface, the offer price is posted in the price field with the selection of the offer price in the first interface, and the offer size is posted in the size field with the selection of the offer size in the first interface, which are also not disclosed by the references cite by the Examiner.

The Examiner asserts that Tuck teaches posting from a first interface to a second interface "based on a selection" with reference to Figs. 21-22 and Col. 14, lines 17-62. In this regard, the Examiner has not fully considered the language of claim 19. That is, trading variables are posted in the second interface based on the selection of the particular trade variables in the first interface, not merely "based on a selection."

B. Independent Claim 37

Claim 37 recites receiving trading command via a first interface that includes a trading variable displayed therein, presenting a second interface that includes at least one button for confirming the trading command, posting at least one trading variable displayed in the first interface into a data entry field in the second interface in response to the selection of the at least one button once and submitting the trade command for execution in response the selection of the at least one button again. The references cited by the Examiner fail to disclose or otherwise suggest posting data from the first interface in response to a selection of the button in the second interface once and submitting the trade command for execution in response to a selection of the button again.

In rejecting claim 37, the Examiner merely directs Applicants to the rejections for claims 1 and 2. The features of claim 37 noted above are not found in either of claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, the Examiner has not provided any reference in rejection the features of claim 37.

B. <u>Official Notice</u>

The Examiner has taken official notice, either expressly or by virtue of failing to cite a reference for an assertion. Applicants submit that the features of the pending claims for which the Examiner officially notices are not well-known at least at the time of the filing of the present application. Applicants traverse the Examiner's taking of official notice and demand that the Examiner produce documentary evidence to support his position if the rejections are to be maintained.

B. <u>The Dependent Claims</u>

The dependent claims are allowable for the same reasons as the claims from which they depend. Applicants submit that the dependent claims are patentable for additional reasons. While deemed unnecessary to argue these additional reasons at this time, given the arguments presented above, Applicants reserve the right to present such argument, including the interpretation of any terms of the claims, should it become necessary or desirable to do so.

The Examiner continues to reject claims that have been cancelled, including claims 11-16, 20-22, 26-28, and 30-32, . It appears that the Examiner is merely copying the rejections from previous office actions without any consideration with regard to any amendments made therein. Applicants request that the Examiner consider all of the claims individually and fully before rejecting any claim.

IV.   Conclusion

          For the above reasons, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for each of the pending claims. Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentable over the references cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully solicited.

          The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at 212-829-5407 to expedite prosecution.

                                        Respectfully submitted,

January 8, 2006   /Antonio Papageorgiou/
Date   Antonio Papageorgiou
                                          Reg. No. 53,431
                                        Attorney for Applicants